

Exhibit F



ADS Chapter 303

Grants and Cooperative Agreements
to
Non-Governmental Organizations

Revision Date: 01/30/2007
Responsible Office: M/OAA/P
File Name: 303_013007_cd47

01/30/2007 Revision

b. To be eligible for assistance under the Private Voluntary Organization grant program and other programs listed in 22 CFR 203.1, both U.S. Private Voluntary Organizations and International Private Voluntary Organizations must be registered with USAID, as required by 22 CFR 203. The registration requirement does not apply to local Private Voluntary Organizations.

c. **Qualifications.** The SO Team develops the minimum qualifications for applicant consideration. However, if the Agreement Officer determines that the criteria are so restrictive that they severely limit competition, the Agreement Officer may request the Activity Manager to broaden the criteria, or require the Activity Manager to process an exception to competition, as provided in 303.3.6.6, in order to make the planned award.

d. **Multi-tiered Competition.** The SO Team, with the approval of the Agreement Officer, may establish a two or more tiered competition system. The SO Team may ask potential applicants to submit an executive summary or concept paper and corresponding budget information. After it reviews and evaluates these submissions, it conducts a second level of competition, using more specific evaluation criteria, among a selection of the best applicants to the first competition and requesting more detailed applications. The SO team may conduct additional levels of competition only if the second level does not adequately identify activities to be funded. Section V of the RFA for this type of competition must explain the intended process so that potential applicants know what to expect at each phase.

303.3.6.3 Evaluation Criteria Effective Date: 06/01/2006

The SO team is responsible for developing evaluation criteria used to evaluate applications. At a minimum, the criteria must include the following:

- Technical merits of the applications,
- Cost effectiveness and cost realism of the application,
- Past performance of the applicant, and
- Branding strategy and marketing plan.

The evaluation criteria in an announcement must give as much information as practical to allow potential applicants to judge whether it is in their best interest to incur costs to apply for an award. The criteria must address the importance of the technical and/or administrative elements, but must not be unduly restrictive. It is not necessary to quantify the relative weight of the criteria, but the announcement must identify the relative importance of the criteria. The Activity Manager must get the Agreement Officer's approval of the criteria before USAID publishes it in the RFA or APS.

01/30/2007 Revision

a. Past performance. An applicant's past performance can serve as an indicator of the quality of its future performance. An applicant must provide a list of all contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements involving similar or related programs during the three years before the application. Reference information must include the location, award numbers if available; a brief description of work performed; and points of contact with current telephone numbers. The Activity Manager determines whether to require this information as part of the initial application, or to require it later from a limited number of applicants who have the best chance of being selected for an award. Requiring the information at a later date may be appropriate where USAID is conducting a "prequalification" competition (see 303.3.6.2.d). In any event, the Activity Manager must obtain past performance information before selection, and make that information part of the written evaluation that the Activity Manager forwards to the Agreement Officer. See information on the use of Past Performance at: <http://www.acqnet.gov/Library/ OFPP/ BestPractices/pastperformguide.htm>

(1) **Evaluating Past Performance.** The Activity Manager and Technical Evaluation Committee defined in 303.3.6.4 are responsible for evaluating an applicant's past performance. The Activity Manager and Technical Evaluation Committee will validate an applicant's past performance reference information by relying on existing evaluations to the maximum extent possible; and making a reasonable, good faith effort to contact all references to obtain verification or corroboration on the following evaluation criteria:

- How well an applicant performed,
- The relevancy of that the program work,
- Instances of good performance,
- Instances of poor performance,
- Significant achievements,
- Significant problems, and
- Any indications of excellent or exceptional performance in the most critical areas.

The Activity Manager and Technical Evaluation Committee may contact references other than those provided in the application if the RFA or APS states that other references may be contacted.

01/30/2007 Revision

(2) Assessing how recent and relevant the past performance information is;

(3) Evaluating the past performance of the team, consortia, or joint venture members and proposed subaward organizations, along with the applicant's past performance; and

(3) Including an analysis and rationale for the conclusions reached regarding an applicant's past performance.

(4) The Technical Evaluation Committee may use the Contractor Performance System (CPS) and the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) if there is information available on the recipient in these systems, taking into account the differences between performance under acquisition and performance under assistance.

b. No Requirement for Prior USAID Experience. RFA and APS documents for award of USAID assistance instruments must not contain minimum qualification or evaluation criteria/selective factors requiring "prior USAID experience."

c. Gender issues. USAID must address gender issues in all USAID-funded activities (see ADS 201.3.12.6). USAID must include a statement outlining gender issues or a rationale for not including such a statement in the competitive RFA or APS, in accordance with ADS 201.3.12.6. The Approving Official (see ADS 201.3.12.16) determines the appropriateness of the statement or the rationale as part of the pre-obligation requirements. If the SO team decides that it should not incorporate gender issues, it must document the decision. When USAID directs applicants to incorporate gender issues into the activity, the RFA or APS must state the requirement.

When developing specific criteria for evaluating an applicant's plan to incorporate gender issues, the SO team must consult, to the extent necessary, with the Bureau for Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade, Office of Women in Development (EGAT/WID). EGAT/WID will provide the SO team with guidance on structuring the criteria to evaluate the plan's positive impacts on the socio-economic status of women, varying impacts on men and women, and methods for measuring these impacts.

d. Volunteers for Prosperity. Executive Order 13317, signed by the President on September 25, 2003 (Executive Order 13317), requires that an applicant's use of highly skilled United States volunteers be an evaluation factor in the selection of applications for assistance activities to be implemented abroad under these initiatives:

- Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief,
- Digital Freedom Initiative,
- Water for the Poor Initiative,

01/30/2007 Revision

- Trade for African Development and Enterprise Initiative,
- Middle East Partnership Initiative, and
- Other Presidential Initiatives that will be identified in the future.

e. Environmental Concerns. The Activity Manager must ensure that the requirements for environmental impact assessment in 22 CFR 216 have been met, approved in writing by the relevant Bureau Environmental Officer and are incorporated in the RFA, APS and award, as needed. When USAID directs applicants to address environmental concerns in the activity, the RFA or APS must state the requirement. ADS 204 contains detailed guidance on environmental concerns and ADS 201, ADS 202, and ADS 203 contain additional guidance on incorporating ADS 204 into planning, achieving and learning processes.

f. Branding and Marking. It is a federal statutory and regulatory requirement that all USAID programs, projects, activities, public communications, and commodities that USAID partially or fully funds under a USAID grant or cooperative agreement or other assistance award or subaward, must be marked appropriately overseas with the USAID Identity. See Section 641, Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; 22 CFR 226.91. Under the regulation, USAID requires the submission of a Branding Strategy and a Marking Plan, but only by the "apparent successful applicant," as defined in the regulation. The apparent successful applicant's proposed Marking Plan may include a request for approval of one or more exceptions to marking requirements established in 22 CFR 226.91. The AO is responsible for evaluating and approving the Branding Strategy and a Marking Plan (including any request for exceptions) of the apparently successful applicant, consistent with the provisions "Branding Strategy," "Marking Plan," and "Marking of USAID-funded Assistance Awards" contained in AAPD 05-11 and in 22 CFR 226.91. See also ADS 320. Please note that in contrast to "exceptions" to marking requirements, waivers based on circumstances in the host country must be approved by Mission Directors or other USAID Principal Officers, see 22 CFR 226.91(j). Please contact OAA/Policy, GC/A&A, or USAID's Senior Advisor on Brand Management if you have any questions about the applicability of either AAPD 05-11 or 22 CFR 226.91.

303.3.6.4 Reviewing and Evaluating Applications

- a.** At least two people (three or more is preferable) will be appointed to a Technical Evaluation Committee to evaluate applications. The Technical Evaluation Committee must evaluate the applications using the stated evaluation criteria. The Technical Evaluation Committee must keep selection information and applicant proprietary data confidential.
- b.** Committee members must possess the requisite technical knowledge or expertise to evaluate the technical merit of the applications. USAID may make exceptions with the approval of the Agreement Officer.